



Stony Brook University

Arts & Sciences Senate

Meeting Minutes
October 12, 2020
3:30PM - 5:00PM
Virtual Meeting

Meeting called to order by A&S Senate President John Torre at 3:34 PM.

1. Acceptance of the Agenda [October 12, 2020 Agenda](#)
The motion to accept the agenda is carried.
2. Approval of September 2020 Meeting Minutes [September 14, 2020 Minutes](#)
The approval of the September 14, 2020 minutes is carried.
3. Opening remarks by Jason Torre, A&S Senate President
 - a. The A&S Senate, with 4 affiliate bodies, will invite all 4 Dean's to each of the monthly meetings with specific invitations to Deans on a rotating basis to present a report.
 - Q. Norm G. asked why the CAS Dean is not required to present at each of the A&S Senate meetings as the Dean of the College of Arts and Science
 - A. Jason T. agreed to bring the question before the EC.
4. Academic Judiciary Committee Discussion (Marie Huffman) [AJC Report](#)
 - a. Marie H. voiced the desire to develop an additional mission to share information to help faculty prevent and process academic violations.
 - b. Online tutoring sites are contributing to increased violations, up 100% from the previous year, correlating with the pandemic.
 - c. Faculty should monitor the sites for unauthorized downloaded materials which should be reported to academic_judiciary@stonybrook.edu.

Patricia B.: Of the 7 cases that have been heard this year, all have been linked to online cheating and students have become very creative in their methods.

5. Presentation of School of Journalism Name Change (Dean Lindenfeld)

[Proposal to Rename the SOJ](#)

[Power Point Presentation](#)

- a. The change being proposed is from the School of Journalism to the School of Communication and Journalism.
 - b. Expanding the name to include 'communications' will increase leverage and
 - c. SOJ no longer reflects the major changes being developed in science, math, digital and environmental communication.
 - d. The department will have the only master's program in the country specific to science communication, pending SUNY approval. opportunities, including a broader range of students and partnerships.
Tracey I.: confirmed that many students were indeed lost due to the lack of a communications program.
Norm G.: acknowledged that there had been attempts to create a School of Communications years ago and was delighted that SOJ is spearheading this initiative.
 - e. Through acclamation, the proposal to change the name of the SOJ to the School of Communication and Journalism is approved.
6. Promotion & Tenure COVID-19 Referee Sample Letters (Joanne Davila & Trevor Sears)
- [Proposed change to solicitation for external letter writers](#)
- a. The pandemic has had a significant negative impact on many scholars' productivity and they should not have that used against them.
 - b. The change will also make clear the time frame on which the candidate should be evaluated, for any reason, including COVID-19.
 - c. This will be brought to a vote in the November meeting.
7. Introduction to the History of SBU Governance (Norman Goodman)
- a. In 1964, 2 governance organizations were formed:
 - i. Senate which was composed of all members of the faculty
 - ii. Assembly which was composed of all members of the professional staff
 - b. Late 1960's or early 70's, changes were made from a universal body to a representational body due to lack of faculty attending and in the assigning responsibility to departments to elect representatives.
 - i. Integration of the Senate and the Assembly into one Stony Brook Senate maintained the faculty as the prominent constituency.
 - ii. This change addressed the need for more shared governance by administrations and allowed the professional staff more input based on their roles and responsibilities in the planning, supervision, enabling and execution of academic programs.
 - iii. Students were added since academic policy clearly affected them.
 - iv. A number of Standing Committees were created at this time, adding to the sole EC.

8. Presentation of Academic Senate Proposal (Frederick Walter)

[Rethinking the Structure of the Senate](#)

- a. The current senate structure has been around since 1975 and higher education has become more interdisciplinary and complex.
- b. No one currently represents the faculty in particular, as professional staff are by PEG and students by USG and GSO.
- c. The proposal is that there will be an Academic Senate to deal with all things academic.
- d. The Academic Senate will work with the Provost and look up to the University Senate.
- e. The proposal allows for the University Senate to deal with broader, non-academic matters and will work with the President.
- f. It eliminates the crossover of information and will encourage consistency with the School of Medicine, the Dental School and the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, acknowledging the interdisciplinarity of academics today.
- g. Professional staff may be voting members of Standing Committees, either by election or ex-officio.

Discussion:

-Ken L. expressed deep concerns about the proposal, stating that the combined senate is a source of great strength and that academic matters are not solely the concern of faculty.

-Fred W. answered by emphasizing that this is not to eliminate the University Senate, but instead to off-load some of the work done by the current senate and to ensure policy consistencies throughout the University.

-Pam W. brought up the statewide resolution ensuring that professional staff have the right to participate in local and state shared governance and that this proposal is in conflict with what this is meant to achieve. Also, professional staff are important to the academic mission and to separate them is not a good idea in her opinion.

-Fred W. responded by saying that the University Senate will still exist and the Academic Senate will report to the University Senate.

-Pam W. added that finding even more people to serve will become a challenge since it is already difficult to find people to fill existing positions.

-Fred W. suggested that faculty may be more willing to serve if they felt they had more of a voice, and a more direct line to the Provost.

-Joanne D. expressed concern about removing the Deans' role in the process and that the direct link to the Provost may or may not be problematic.

-Fred W. responded that this is a means to spread out the work by one senate responding to the Provost and the other to the President.

-Paula D. agrees that the senate needs revamping but the separating of professionals and faculty is a form of discrimination at a time when social justice movements are being addressed across the country. If staff will be in the position of serving on academic committees, then they should have a voice as

representative for the academic senate as well. The senates of SOM and the College of Engineering are not fully functional units whereas the A&S Senate is a fully functional senate, serving Dean's and constituents. By eliminating the Deans, it will eliminate an important part of the process since each college has a unique flavor and each Dean has a unique set of responsibilities.

-Fred W. said that the idea is to work under one Provost rather than the current two. He asked why there are no faculty on the PEG.

-Paula D. explained that the PEG is made up of the professional staff from both east and west campus who are elected professionals serving on a committee or as an at-large senator and suggested that a faculty governance board be created for the elected faculty members to work out issues that can lead into the Senate Agenda.

-Fred W. stated that this exactly what he is proposing, a faculty representative body with staff still involved at the committee level and that his proposal will need tweaking to be accepted.

-Norm G. made the point that leaving students out of and removing their voice from the academic process is essentially criminal in this day and age. The concerns that relate strictly to the needs and rights of faculty already have faculty only committees addressing them. All other issues are not faculty only concerns. The faculty already have a decisive voice, and the control, in the senate but they have to show up to vote. The separation proposed is not conducive to making this a great university or attracting quality faculty, staff or students.

-Fred W.'s rebuttal was that the things mentioned by Norm would still be governed under the University Senate.

-Tracy I. said that, as an academic advisor, she feels the staff voice is really important, especially in academic matters, because of the staff access to student questions, concerns and requests.

-Axel D. says the Fred has a point, describing our current senate structures as confusing. His understanding of Fred's proposal is that it is not to add more bodies and exclude people, but instead to reorganize what we do have in a way that makes more sense. In his mind, there is a lot of duplication between the A&S Senate and the University Senate. The inclination for all the schools to have their own PTC's is a step in the wrong direction. Now, with a new University President, is a good time to address these issues as she looks into ways to improve the campus.

-Fred W. suggested a counter proposal be made.

-Jason T. said that a professional viewpoint will be scheduled and a counter proposal will be developed at a later date.

9. Faculty Rights, Responsibilities & Policies Committee (Frederick Walter) [Report](#)
 - a. Faculty interests evolve with time, therefore involving change.
 - b. The Chairs are better positioned to decide the productivity and responsibilities of individual faculty within their own department as opposed to a single standard set by the Dean.

- c. There is a threat of minimizing faculty freedom and autonomy.
- d. Workload, as a term, is a union matter and therefore can not be addressed at the Dean's level.
- e. Forced reduction in research to accommodate higher teaching load could adversely affect the current AAU standing and our reputation as an R1 university.
- f. If some of the grant overhead were returned to the faculty, as an incentive, it might encourage putting in more work to bring in more money.
- g. There is a bottleneck imposed by the Dean of the Graduate School that is limiting the number of TA's available and subsequently hurting some research on campus.
- h. In some departments, salaries at SBU do not match those of their peers at public R1 universities. More money might incentivise more work.

10. Old Business: none

11. New Business: Dr. John True

- a. President McInnis's initiative to guide our future process to rename buildings, space or structures on campus has evolved into a committee of 16 with only two faculty members, both from the same department, resulting in underrepresentation within the committee. There needs to be more representation by the faculty and from a broader sampling of departments.
-Norm G. brought up that in 1990, as Senate President, he established with Dr. Marburger that all committees appointed by the administration would have to allow the Senate to be consulted on the composition, charge and membership, and make sure any new committee isn't in conflict with existing committees.
- b. A warning that if you are asked for quotes about a grant, it could show up in the publicity of a political campaign as happened recently with Dr. Davalos and posted in a Zeldin press release. [Zeldin Press Release](#)
- c. An effort is being made to make students more aware that they are violating intellectual property regulations by posting course materials on sites. It is currently not in the student contact code.

13. Motion to adjourn is carried. (5:08)

Respectfully submitted,
Elizabeth Fish
A&S Senate Secretary